UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,390	06/20/2003	Avijit Chatterjee	ROC920030238US1	7557

7590 05/22/2006	EXAMINER
William J. McGinnis, Jr.	HARPER, LEON JONATHAN
IBM Corporation, Dept. 917	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2166	

3605 Highway 52 North
Rochester, MN 55901-7829

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/600,390	CHATTERJEE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leon J. Harper	2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 March 2006_.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-3,6-9,11-19,21-27 and 29-35_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-3,6-9,11-19,21-27 and 29-35_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _10 March 2006_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _5/12/06_.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   The amendment filed 3/10/2006 has been entered. The specification has been amended. Figure 3A has been changed to correct a typographical error. Claims 1,9,15,16,19,21,22,23,24,25,27 have been amended. Claims 4-5,10,20 and 28 have been canceled. Claims 1-3,6-9, 11-19, 21-27, 29-35 are pending in this office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3,6-9, 11-19, 21-27, 29-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating
obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-3,6-8, 11,19,21-27,29-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over US 20040205545 (hereinafter Bar) in view of US 6519603

(hereinafter Bays).

As for claim 1 Bar discloses: one or more applications for manipulating data (See

paragraph 0021); an annotation server configured to handle calls from one or more

application programming interface functions (See paragraph 0163); an annotation store

for storing annotations created for data manipulated by the one or more applications

(See paragraph 0025 lines 9-10); and an annotation browser configured to access the

annotation store and provide one or more graphical user interface for creating and

viewing annotations for data manipulated by the one or more applications wherein the

annotation browser is configured to access annotations in the annotation store

independently of applications in which the annotation were created (See paragraph

0025).

While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure

of an annotation browser is not necessarily explicit. Bays however does explicitly

disclose an annotation browser (See column 7 lines 9-12). It would have been obvious

to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of

Bays into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious because if

users are annotating different types of content (See background of Bar) then a browser

to scan or flip though the annotations is a necessary element to help users search for

content based on the annotations and not the type of data.

As for claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Bays discloses

wherein the annotation browser is separate to the one or more applications (See

column 7 lines 9-12).

As for claim 3 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Bar discloses:

wherein the annotation browser is a web-based browser (See paragraph 0059).

As for claim 6 the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated, and further Bar discloses

wherein the annotation browser is configured to access the annotation store via the

annotation server (See table XVII or paragraph 0079).

As for claim 7 the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and further Bays discloses:

a set of one or more application programming interface functions, wherein the

annotation browser is configured to communicate with the annotation server via calls to

one or more of the application programming interface functions (See column 6 35-38).

As for claim 8 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further discloses:

wherein the system further comprises one or more graphical user interfaces, accessible

from within one or more of the applications, for creating and viewing annotations (See column 6 lines 45-48).

As for claim 11 the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Bays discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display data and indications of what displayed data has one or more corresponding annotations (See column 7 lines 32-35 note that the data is being displayed as well and the indicators are attached to the bar).

As for claim 19: Bar discloses: one or more applications for manipulating data (See paragraph 0021); an annotation server configured to handle calls from one or more application programming interface functions (See paragraph 0163); at least one application data store for storing data manipulated by the one or more applications (See paragraph 0024) at least one annotation store for storing annotations created for data manipulated by the one or more applications (See paragraph 0025 lines 9-10); a web-based browser configured to access both the one or more application stores, and the one or more annotation stores wherein the executable component is configured to access annotations in the annotation store independently of applications in which the annotation were created (See paragraph 0025).

While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure of a web based browser is not necessarily explicit. Bays however does explicitly

disclose a web based browser (See column 7 lines 9-12). It would have been obvious to

an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Bays

into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious because if users are

annotating different types of content (See background of Bar) then a browser to scan or

flip though the annotations is a necessary element to help users search for content

based on the annotations and not the type of data.

As for claim 21 the rejection of claim 19 is incorporated, and further Bays

discloses: wherein the web based browser provides one or more graphical user

interface screens allowing a user to query the annotation store for annotations satisfying

one or more specified annotation query criteria (See column 6 lines 57-62 note the

integration engine can query a variety of different sources).

As for claim 22 the rejection of claim 21 is incorporated, and further Bays

discloses: wherein the web based browser provides one or more graphical user

interface screens allowing a user to query the application data store for annotations

satisfying one or more specified annotation query criteria (See column 6 lines 57-62

note the integration engine can query a variety of different sources).

As for claim 23 the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and further Bays

discloses: one or more graphical user interface screens for displaying results data

satisfying the one or more specified application data query criteria (See column 6 lines

62-65); and one or more graphical user interface screens for creating annotations for

results data satisfying the one or more specified application data query (See column 6

lines 62-65 note: data can be returned in any form).

As for claim 24 the rejection of claim 22 is incorporated, and further Bays

discloses: querying the application data store for data satisfying the one or more

specified application data query criteria; and querying the annotation data store for

annotations satisfying the one or more specified annotation query criteria that are

associated with the data satisfying the one or more specified application data query

criteria (See column 7 lines 9-14 note: you can query data or annotations, and once you

get data you can view annotations).

As for claim 25 Bar discloses: an annotation database for storing annotations

separately from the data sources associated with the annotations (See paragraph

0025); a set of annotatable data objects points defining portions of data sources

associated with the annotations described by the associated annotations (See

paragraph 0026 anchor=point). A set of structures, each defining a set of annotation

fields (See paragraph 0028) a set of plug-in component, each for interfacing between

one or more applications and an annotation server (See paragraph 0163); an annotation

server configured to receive, via the plug-in components, request to access annotations

for one or more of the annotatable data object points issued by the one or more

applications running on the silent computer and generated a graphical user interface

screen , based on the annotation structure associated with the one or more of the annotabtable data object points, for creating or viewing annotations for one or more annotatable data object points (See paragraph 00163 for sever configuration and See paragraph 0025); and a browser is configured to access annotations in the annotation store independently of the applications in which the annotations were created (See paragraph 0025).

While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure of a web based browser is not necessarily explicit. Bays however does explicitly disclose a web based browser (See column 7 lines 9-12). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of Bays into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious because if users are annotating different types of content (See background of Bar) then a browser to scan or flip though the annotations is a necessary element to help users search for content based on the annotations and not the type of data.

As for claim 26 the rejection of claim 25 is incorporated, and further wherein the browser application is configured to provide links to annotated data objects (See column 2 lines 40-42).

As for claim 27 Bar discloses: installing the annotation management system on the network (See paragraph 0163); identifying annotatable data objects manipulated by

at least one application on the network capable of being annotated by the annotation

management system (See paragraph 0025 and apply 0163 to get this result in a

network setting)

While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure

of providing an annotation browser separate from the at least one application for

browsing annotations created for the annotatable data objects wherein the annotation

browser is configured to query both annotations and annotated data is not necessarily

explicit. Bays however does disclose providing an annotation browser separate from the

at least one application for browsing annotations created for the annotatable data

objects (See column 7 lines 9-12), wherein the annotation browser is configured to

query both annotations and annotated data (See column 7 lines 9-14 note: you can

query data or annotations, and once you get data you can view annotations). It would

have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated

the teaching of Bays into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious

because if users are annotating different types of content (See background of Bar) then

a browser to scan or flip though the annotations is a necessary element to help users

search for content based on the annotations and not the type of data.

As for claim 29 the rejection of claim 27 is incorporated, and further Bays

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to query both annotations and

annotated data (See column 7 lines 9-12 note: for this action you will need the

integration engine also see column 7 line 59).

As for claim 30 the rejection of claim 29 is incorporated, and further Bays

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to receive, from a requesting

entity, a request to simultaneous search both annotations and annotated data, based on

at least one annotation search condition and at least one data search condition provided

in the request (See column 6 lines 60-65).

As for claim 31 the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated, and further Bays

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to return to the

requesting entity a list of data objects satisfying the at least one annotation search

condition and describing data satisfying the at least one data search condition (See

column 11 lines 45-50).

As for claim 32 the rejection of claim 30 is incorporated, and further Bays

discloses: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to return, to the

requesting entity, a list of annotations satisfying the at least one annotation search

condition and describing data satisfying the at least one data search condition (See

column 6 lines 60-65).

As for claim 33 Bar discloses: providing one or more graphical user interfaces (See paragraph 0165): While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure of specifying one or more annotation search conditions and providing one or more data search conditions and simultaneously searching both annotation and annotated data, based on the at least one annotation search condition and at least one data search condition is not necessarily explicit. Bays however does disclose: specifying one or more annotation search conditions and providing one or more data search conditions (See column 11 lines 45-47) and simultaneously searching both annotation and annotated data, based on the at least one annotation search condition and at least one data search condition (See column 7 line 59).

As for claim 34 the rejection of claim 33 is incorporated, and further Bays discloses: wherein the operations further comprise displaying a list of data objects satisfying the at least one data search condition and having annotations satisfying the at least one annotation search condition (See column 6 lines 60-65 result can be in any form).

As for claim 35 the rejection of claim 33 is incorporated, and further Bays discloses: wherein the operations further comprise displaying a list of annotations satisfying the at least one annotation search condition and describing data satisfying the at least one data search condition (See column 6 lines 60-65 result can be in any form also see column 12 lines 15-20).

Claims 9,12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bar in view of Bays and in further view of US 5537526 (hereinafter Anderson), and in

further view of US5253362 (Nolan).

As for claim 9 Bar discloses: one or more applications for manipulating

data (See paragraph 0021); an annotation store for storing annotations created for data

manipulated by the one or more applications (See paragraph 0025 lines 9-10) an

annotation browser configured to access the annotation store and provide one or more

graphical user interfaces for creating and viewing annotations for data manipulated by

the one or more (See paragraph 0025).

While Bar does not differ substantially from the claimed invention the disclosure

of an annotation browser is not necessarily explicit. Bays however does explicitly

disclose an annotation browser (See column 7 lines 9-12). It would have been obvious

to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of

Bays into the system of Bar. The modification would have been obvious because if

users are annotating different types of content (See background of Bar) then a browser

to scan or flip though the annotations is a necessary element to help users search for

content based on the annotations and not the type of data.

The combination of Bar and Bays while not differing substantially from the

claimed invention the disclosure of an annotation browser configured to display

annotations and links to associated annotated data objects and wherein selecting the

links to the associated data objects causes an application used to manipulate the

associated data objects to be invoked. Anderson however does disclose an annotation

browser configured to display annotations and links to associated annotated data

objects(See column 5 lines 6-11);; and wherein selecting the links to the associated

data objects causes an application used to manipulate the associated data objects to be

invoked (See column 4 lines 36-40), while Nolan discloses storing annotations (See

column 5 lines 16-20: note the annotation must me stored). It would have been obvious

to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to have incorporated the teaching of

Anderson and Nolan into the system of Bar and Bay. The modification would have been

obvious because when users share data it is often desirable to be able to find related or

associated annotated documents and being able to link to documents is the best way to

show through annotations that two documents are related to give other users a better

idea of how the annotation relates to the document (See Bays column 1 lines 17-20).

As for claim 12 the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further Anderson

discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display one or more

annotation icons proximate to an annotated data object (See Anderson column 4 lines

64-66). It would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the pertinent art to

have incorporated the teaching of Anderson into the system of Bar and Bay. The

modification would have been obvious because when users share data it is often

desirable to be able to find related or associated annotated documents and being able

to link to documents is the best way to show through annotations that two documents

are related to give other users a better idea of how the annotation relates to the document (See Bays column 1 lines 17-20).

As for claim 13, the rejection of claim 12 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein: at least one common annotation describes more than one data object (See figure 6 and column 5 lines 51-55), and the annotation browser is configured to display a common annotation icon proximate to data objects described by the common annotation (See column 5 lines 60-65 notes the nurses notes hold annotations).

As for claim 14, the rejection of claim 13 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is configured to display different annotation icons proximate to data objects described by different annotations (See figure 5 and note that you are going to get a different view depending on what the annotation is).

As for claim 15, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has a single annotation and a second annotation icon to indicate a displayed data object has multiple annotations (See column 5 line60- column 6 line 4 and noting that icon is in a cell and will display differently depending on the annotation) .

As for claim 16, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses: wherein the annotation browser is configured to display a first portion of annotation data from an annotation, in response to a user positioning a cursor over an associated annotation icon (See Figure 5 "showing details").

As for claim 17, the rejection of claim 16 is incorporated, and further Nolan disclose: wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, display a second portion of annotation data from the annotation (See figure 6 "expanded annotations").

As for claim 18, the rejection of claim 17 is incorporated, and further Nolan discloses wherein the annotation browser is further configured to, in response to the user selecting the annotation icon, retrieve the second portion of annotation data from the annotation store (See figure 6 and note that annotations are contained within the local data storage).

Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leon J. Harper whose telephone number is 571-272-0759. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM - 4:00Pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Hosain T. Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LJH
Leon J. Harper
May 12, 2006

MOHAMMAD ALI
PRIMARY EXAMINER